



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,653	08/20/2003	Toby Freyman	S63.2B-14157-US01	8819
490	7590	08/26/2010	EXAMINER	
VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS, P.A. SUITE 400, 6640 SHADY OAK ROAD EDEN PRAIRIE, MN 55344				WITCZAK, CATHERINE
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3767				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/26/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte TOBY FREYMAN, TIMOTHY J. MICKLEY,
MARIA J. PALASIS, and WENDY NAIMARK

Appeal 2009-011016
Application 10/645,653
Technology Center 3700

Before WILLIAM F. PATE III, STEVEN D.A. McCARTHY and
MICHAEL W. O'NEILL, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

McCARTHY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL¹

¹ The two-month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 1.304, or for filing a request for rehearing, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 41.52, begins to run from the “MAIL DATE” (paper delivery mode) or the “NOTIFICATION DATE” (electronic delivery mode) shown on the PTOL-90A cover letter attached to this decision.

1 STATEMENT OF THE CASE

2 Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 of the Examiner's final
3 decision rejecting claims 25-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being
4 unpatentable over Clark (US 5,713,853, issued Feb. 3, 1998) and Ding (US
5 6,364,856 B1, issued Apr. 2, 2002). We have jurisdiction over the appeal
6 under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

7 We REVERSE.

8 Claim 25 is the only independent claim on appeal. It is illustrative of
9 the claims on appeal:

10 25. A medical device for delivering a therapeutic
11 agent to an internal portion of a patient's body, the
12 medical device comprising:
13 a shaft;
14 a self-expanding delivery member in
15 operative communication with the shaft, the
16 delivery member having a proximal end and a
17 distal end and being shaped in a continuous solid
18 cylindrical configuration from a porous material
19 capable of (i) releasing the therapeutic agent to the
20 internal portion of the patient's body and (ii) being
21 in a collapsed state;
22 a therapeutic agent delivery lumen defined
23 by a lumen wall, wherein the therapeutic agent
24 delivery lumen is in fluid communication with the
25 delivery member for fluidly connecting the
26 delivery member with a therapeutic agent source;
27 a retention member in operative
28 communication with the delivery member, the
29 retention member being configured and arranged
30 to selectively collapse the delivery member; and
31 a mechanism capable of applying negative
32 pressure through the therapeutic agent delivery
33 lumen to remove fluid from the delivery member.
34

1 Independent claim 25 requires the use of a self-expanding delivery
2 member being shaped in a continuous *solid* cylindrical configuration from a
3 porous material. (App. Br. 10-12, Reply Br. 2-8). The Examiner incorrectly
4 finds that “Ding et al. teach in Figures 2 and 3 that it is known to use a
5 delivery member having a continuous solid cylindrical shape.” (Ans. 3).
6 The Examiner has not identified the structure in Ding’s Figures 2 and 3
7 which is a solid.

8 The issue raised in this appeal may be resolved by interpreting the
9 term “continuous solid” as used in the claims. In the absence of an express
10 definition of a claim term in the specification or a clear disclaimer of scope,
11 the claim term is interpreted as taking any ordinary and customary meaning
12 recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art consistent with the overall
13 disclosure of the specification. *In re ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.*, 496 F.3d
14 1374, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054 (Fed. Cir.
15 1997).

16 The Specification does not provide an explicit definition for the term
17 “continuous solid” but does provide useful insight to deduce what a
18 “continuous solid” is not. The Specification on paragraph [0027] on page 6
19 discusses the advantages of a solid cylindrical configuration including,
20 “[t]he solid configuration gives the agent delivery member 18 greater
21 structural strength, preventing *accidental tears* in the agent delivery member
22 18.” (italics added).

23 Furthermore, the Background of the Invention section of the
24 Specification in paragraph [005] on page 1 discusses the use on an *inflatable*
25 *member*, i.e., a balloon, which exerts significant pressure upon a lumen wall
26 to force a therapeutic agent from a delivery member. As such the Appellants

1 appear to differentiate between an inflatable member, i.e., a balloon, and a
2 continuous solid cylindrical configuration from a porous material capable of
3 (i) releasing the therapeutic agent to the internal portion of the patient's body
4 and (ii) being in a collapsed state. Although it is clear from Figure 6 of the
5 Specification 6 that a balloon, i.e., balloon 170, can be part of the overall
6 medical device, a balloon cannot be considered a self-expanding delivery
7 member shaped in a continuous solid cylindrical.

8 Therefore, the term “continuous solid” excludes a hollow balloon.
9 The Appellants correctly contend “[t]he devices of both Clark et al. and
10 Ding et al. are hollow, i.e., they have lumens extending through the delivery
11 member.” (Reply Br. 8). The Examiner articulates no reasoning which
12 might explain why it would have been obvious from the combined teachings
13 of Clark and Ding to provide a medical device including a self-expanding
14 delivery member shaped in a continuous solid cylindrical configuration as
15 recited in claim 25 despite the failure of either Clark or Ding to describe this
16 feature. We do not sustain the rejections of claims 25-40 under § 103(a) as
17 being unpatentable over Clark and Ding.

18

19 DECISION

20 We REVERSE the Examiner’s decision rejecting claims 25-40.

21

22 REVERSED

23 Klh

24

25

26 VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS, P.A.
27 SUITE 400, 6640 SHADY OAK ROAD
28 EDEN PRAIRIE, MN 55344